Hames Lethur Biggins, Plaintiff

Corenor Puth Ann Minner et Al.

CANOL-18-14 CMS

Plaintit's Reply to State Defendant's David Riesce and Lames Welch Ration
Answer In Opposition to Raintit's Motion for Recliminary Injunction And
Resterining Order

The plaintiff hames hether Diggins, prose, moves this Howerble Court for the

Motion for preliminary injunction and/or temporary restaining order ("P1/18") In support of his position, the plaintiff states the following:

[ On or about February 11,208, by Order of the Court, State defendant's David Pierce.

And Hames Welch in addition to CMS, to file a response to plaintiffs motion and letter motion specifically addressing the "cheonic care medication issue" on or before February 19,2008.

a Unlike deknownt's CMS, the State is not arguing a grant of extension or Enlargement of time. There for the lovet must strike their response. Nonetheless, alternatively plaintiff will respond.

3. The State appears to not have challenged plaintiff claim under the Eighth Amendment. Thus, the Court must consider their argument now and in any tokense procoedings waived.

(Aunot be answered by the plaintiff, because he has'nt asserted any claims under the

1. Plaintiff has already filed his response to CMS, requesting their response be stricken on the grounds to answer not under limitations period, deciret and/or trund as well.

tiest Amendment

So the Court should duly note that all exhibits and seguments contained within his notion for (PI/1RO") is only informative information in regards to the plaintiff's hardship in submitting legal material for photocopies to the institution's law library is constantly vetted for what they call non-legal"in briefs, motions, rete. See Meda v. fitzpateick, 2017. Supp 878 (DCMass. 1971) (there is no valid prison interest in screening and controlling the content of court papers sufficiently compelling so as to limit a prison-er's constitutional right to fore and unfettered access to the love's, and such consorting violates the first Amendmen); Molth v. Mc Donnell, 4180, 539, 411. Ed 935, 945. Ct. 2763 (enjoining state prison officials from deleting material); and Carothers v. Follette, 314 F. Supp 1014 (DCNY) 1970) (reusorship of correspondence with court's is precluded and limited to inspection for contraband, with no authority to read, copy, or delete my material).

of practice committed when prison administrative personnel do not want certain inform-

ation that a impate may possess known outside of person walls.

? It had nothing to do with the exhaustment of grievances.

8. As for the claims made against Cpl. Lisa M. Merson was (a) to demonstrate her repeated actions of confiscating material submitted lether (via) grievances or obtained through the court's and claiming it to be impermissiable for immates, and (b) abusing her authority by implementing disciplinary charges against plaintiff. These actions are irrepresentable regardless of the final consequences, and are repeatable. See <u>Meinstein v. Bradford</u>, 403U.S. 147, 96 S.Ct. 347, 46 LEd. 2330(1975); <u>Abdul-Akbar</u>, 775 F. Supp. at 755 v. 13-14.

Wherefore, for one or all of the hereinabore reasons, State defendant's Pierce and Welch request should be denied. Plaintiff has fully established the criteria for injunctive relief. Pappan Enterprises, Inc., v. Harder's God System & Inc., 143 F. 3d 800, 803 (Sed Cir. 1998); Clem Ocean Action v. York, 37 F. 3d 328, 331 (Sed Cir. 1995); SéR Corp., v. diffy Inbe Intern, Inc., 968 F. 2d 371, 374 (Sed Cir. 1992). This is not a situation where as the

plaintiff disagrees with the medical treatment. See Specially. Gillis, 372 F.3 dat 335(3 ed Cir. 1990). The third Circuit Court of Appeals has held "there is deliberate indefference where prison officials delay medical treatment for non-medical reasons or as in this specific case "continues a course of treament they know is painful in effective or "entails a substantial risk of serious harm. Pouse y Plantier, 182 F.3 d 192, 197 (3 ed Cir. 1999); White 897 F.2 dat 189. It is well documented that the plaintiff has serious medical needs, and that the treatment he is requesting is that which has (A) been recommended by a doctor and approved by the highies & Department of Carrections administration of ficer authorized to linalize all innate medical decision (Bureau Chief: Rick Resourcy). See Plouse, 182 F.3 dat 197.

Therefore, the plaintiff has additionally demonstrated to this court a "limited circumstance" in which "extraordinary remedy is warranted. See <u>Instant dir Freight Cov.</u> C.F. die Freight, Inc., 882 F.21797, 800 (3rd Cir. 1989) (quoting <u>Frank's GMC truck Center, Inc., v. General Motors Corp.</u>, 847 F.21 W., 103 (3rd Cir. 1988).

Dated February 28,2008

Lornes Athur Biggins 319764

James Arthur Biggins 319764

Délaware Correctional Center

1181 Paddock Road, Unit 22/A-U-4

Smyrna Delaware 19977

## **Certificate of Service**

1, dames Lethur Biggins	,hereby certify that I have served a true
And correct cop(jes) of the attached:	Litt's Reply & State Defendant's Auswer In apposition
	wation and Restraining Order upon the following
parties/person (s):	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
TO: Asmes Ellewer Esquires  Balick and Balick Attorneys at Law  Ming Street	TO: <u>Aphelia M. Naters, Esquire</u> Department of dustice  820 North French Street, 8th Flore
Wilmington Delawage 1988	CARVE   State Building Wilmington, Delaware 19801
TO: Clark of the Court United States District Court House	TO:
844 North King Street Lockbox 18	
Wilmington, Delaware 19801	
BY PLACING SAME IN A SEALED ENVE States Mail at the Delaware Correctiona	LOPE, and depositing same in the United I Center, Smyrna, DE 19977.
On this 28 day of Fe	<u>,2008</u>
· 	James Athur Dugins